

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS, INC.,** )  
 )  
 **Plaintiff,** )  
 )  
 **v.** )  
 )  
 **UNIVERSAL REMOTE CONTROL,** )  
 **INC.** )  
 )  
 **Defendants.** )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

**CASE NO. SACV 12-00329 AG (JPRx)**  
  
**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S  
MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES,  
DKT. NO. 447**

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2  
3 Exceptional cases are, by definition, the exception. But since *Octane*'s change in the  
4 standard, the rule seems to be for prevailing parties to bring an exceptional case motion. This  
5 case is no exception. But it is exceptional.

6 Plaintiff Universal Electronics, Inc. ("UEI" or "Plaintiff") brought this patent  
7 infringement suit against its competitor, Defendant Universal Remote Control, Inc. ("URC" or  
8 Defendant"). After a jury trial on the legal issues and a concurrent bench trial on the equitable  
9 issues, the Court entered judgment in favor of Defendant. (Dkt. No. 453.) Defendant now  
10 moves for a determination that it is entitled to its attorneys' fees, with the dollar amount to be set  
11 after additional briefing (the "Motion"). (Dkt. No. 447.) Plaintiff opposes the Motion, arguing  
12 that this was a mine-run case. (Dkt. No. 463.)

13 The Court GRANTS the Motion.  
14

15 **BACKGROUND**

16  
17 This is not the first lawsuit between the parties. Plaintiff also sued Defendant on  
18 November 15, 2000 ("the prior case"). In the prior case, Plaintiff asserted, among others, U.S.  
19 Patent No. 5,414,426 ("426 Patent"), and Defendant argued that prior art invalidated it.  
20 Plaintiff replied that it could add Paul Darbee as an inventor to the patent, entitling the patent to  
21 a priority date that predated the alleged prior art. (Trial Ex. 1095 at URCI005385.) But instead  
22 of doing so, Plaintiff dismissed its claim of infringement of the '426 Patent on October 18, 2002  
23 with prejudice. (Miro Decl., Ex. 17, Dkt. No. 447-5 at 13-21.) In 2004, the parties entered into  
24 a settlement and license agreement ending the remainder of the prior case. (Haan Decl., Ex. 8,  
25 Sept. 12, 2013 Hayes Dep., Dkt. No. 176-1 at 7; URCI000303-310.)

26 On March 2, 2012, Plaintiff filed this suit, alleging infringement of the '426 Patent and of  
27 U.S. Patent Nos. 5,614, 906 ("906 Patent"), 6,587,067 ("067 Patent"), and 5,568,367 ("367  
28 Patent"). The '067 Patent had expired at the time of the Complaint, so only back damages were

1 at issue as to that patent.

2 On July 3, 2012, Plaintiff petitioned the United States Patent and Trademark Office  
3 (“PTO”) to do what it had said it could do ten years earlier: add Darbee as an inventor in the  
4 ‘426 Patent. (Trial Ex. 21.) Plaintiff’s petition was accompanied by signed declarations from  
5 Darbee and the three inventors who were named on the patent. (Finkelstein Decl., Ex. 5, Dkt.  
6 No. 463-7 at 109-119.) On July 31, 2013, the PTO granted Plaintiff’s petition, adding Darbee as  
7 a named inventor of the ‘426 Patent. (Finkelstein Decl., Ex. 5, Dkt. No. 463-7 at 123.)

8 On February 1, 2013, the Court issued a Claim Construction Order that invalidated the  
9 only relevant claim in the ‘367 Patent, and later denied Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration of  
10 that issue. (Dkt. Nos. 60, 79.)

11 From February 6, 2013 through February 26, 2013, Defendant filed petitions for *inter*  
12 *partes* review of the ‘426, ‘906, and ‘067 Patents. Defendant then moved to stay the case  
13 pending *inter partes* review, but the Court denied that motion. (Dkt. Nos. 63, 78.) Later, the  
14 Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) declined to institute *inter partes* review of the ‘906  
15 Patent and ‘426 Patent, but instituted review of the ‘067 Patent. (Finkelstein Decl., Ex. 1, Dkt.  
16 No. 463-2 at 3-24; Decision Denying *Inter Partes* Review, IPR2013-00168, Patent 5,414,426  
17 (Aug. 26, 2013); Decision Instituting *Inter Partes* Review, IPR2013-00127, Patent 6,587,067  
18 (July 16, 2013)). In the *inter partes* review of the ‘067 Patent, the PTAB determined that claims  
19 1-6 were unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. (Miro Decl., Ex. 25, Dkt. No. 447-6 at  
20 314-37.)

21 In February 2014, the parties each moved for summary judgment on a variety of issues.  
22 (Dkt. Nos. 159, 161.) Most significantly, the Court granted summary judgment of non-  
23 infringement of the ‘426 Patent and that no damages were available for the ‘067 Patent due to  
24 Plaintiff’s failure to comply with the marking requirement, but held that triable issues remained  
25 concerning the validity of the ‘426 Patent, infringement of the ‘906 Patent, and various defenses.  
26 (Dkt. Nos. 222, 223.)

27 The case proceeded to trial in May 2014, and on May 21, 2014, the jury returned a verdict  
28 in favor of Defendant. (Dkt. No. 408.) The Court resolved the equitable defenses after post-trial

1 briefing. (Dkt. No. 435.)

2  
3 **LEGAL STANDARD**

4  
5 The Patent Act provides that “[t]he court in exceptional cases may award reasonable  
6 attorney fees to the prevailing party.” 35 U.S.C. § 285. In this context, “exceptional” retains its  
7 ordinary meaning of “uncommon, rare, or not ordinary.” *Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health*  
8 *& Fitness, Inc.*, 134 S. Ct. 1749, 1756 (2014). Accordingly, “an ‘exceptional’ case is simply one  
9 that stands out from others with respect to the substantive strength of a party’s litigating position  
10 (considering both the governing law and the facts of the case) or the unreasonable manner in  
11 which the case was litigated.” *Id.* “Section 285 discourages certain ‘exceptional’ conduct by  
12 imposing the cost of bad decisions on the decision maker.” *Cambrian Sci. Corp. v. Cox*  
13 *Commc’ns, Inc.*, \_\_ F. Supp. 3d. \_\_, No. SACV 11-01011 AG, 2015 WL 178417, \*1 (C.D. Cal.  
14 Jan. 6, 2015).

15 District courts determine whether a case is “exceptional” on a case-by-case basis,  
16 “considering the totality of circumstances.” *Id.* Fees may be awarded where “a party’s  
17 unreasonable conduct—while not necessarily independently sanctionable—is nonetheless”  
18 exceptional. *Id.* at 1757. “A case presenting either subjective bad faith or exceptionally  
19 meritless claims may sufficiently set itself apart from mine-run cases to warrant a fee award.”  
20 *Id.* A party must prove its entitlement to fees by a preponderance of the evidence. *Id.* at 1758.

21 “[A] patentee does not act in good faith if it raises an infringement claim in which ‘no  
22 reasonable litigant could realistically expect success on the merits.’” *GP Indus. Inc. v. Eran*  
23 *Indus., Inc.*, 500 F.3d 1369, 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (citation omitted). “For this reason, proper  
24 investigation is an important pre-requisite to filing an infringement claim . . . .” *JS Prods., Inc.*  
25 *v. Kabo Tool Co.*, No. 2:11-cv-01856 RCJ, 2014 WL 7336063, at \*4 (D. Nev. Dec. 22, 2014).

26 In the companion case to *Octane Fitness*, the Supreme Court held that “[b]ecause § 285  
27 commits the determination whether a case is ‘exceptional’ to the discretion of the district court,  
28 that decision is to be reviewed on appeal for abuse of discretion.” *Highmark Inc. v. Allcare*

1 *Health Mgmt. Sys.*, 134 S. Ct. 1744, 1748 (2014). The abuse-of-discretion standard applies to  
2 “all aspects of a district court’s § 285 determination.” *Id.* at 1749.

3 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 54(d)(2)(C) provides that “[t]he court may decide  
4 issues of liability for fees before receiving submissions on the value of services.”

5  
6 **ANALYSIS**

7  
8 The Court analyzes the substantive strength of Plaintiff’s litigating position and Plaintiff’s  
9 manner of litigating for each of the patents in suit. In reviewing the record, the Court is mindful  
10 that evidence at trial showed that this litigation was at least in part motivated by Plaintiff’s desire  
11 for “payback” for Defendant’s successful competition in the marketplace: “We are going to get  
12 VERY aggressive on this quote. We are going to push URC’s margin and price DOWN. That  
13 along with the current lawsuit should push them to the brink. This will be payback for Time  
14 Warner.” (Oct. 4, 2012 email from Plaintiff’s Vice President in charge of U.S. cable remote  
15 sales, Trial Ex. 1358.)

16  
17 **1. THE ‘067 PATENT**

18  
19 Patentees who make or sell products in the United States may notify the public that the  
20 product is patented by marking the product with the patent number. 35 U.S.C. § 287. If a  
21 patentee does not do so, the damages period does not start running until the patentee notifies the  
22 infringer of the infringement. *Id.* Compliance with the marking requirement is a question of  
23 fact, on which the patentee bears the burden of proof. *Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.*, 86 F.3d 1098,  
24 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

25 Here, the Court granted summary judgment that Plaintiff failed to comply with the  
26 marking requirement, so no pre-suit damages were available. (Dkt. No. 222 at 48, 50.) Because  
27 the ‘067 Patent was expired at the time of suit, no post-suit damages were available, either. (*Id.*  
28 at 49.)

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.